



**MEETING MINUTES**  
**CENTRAL WATERFRONT PROCESS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**  
**MARCH 25, 2010**  
**3:30 – 5:00PM SMT 4050**

---

**Attendees**

Bob Donegan  
Gary Glant  
Patrick Gordon  
Craig Hanway  
Mary Johnston  
Cary Moon  
John Nesholm  
John Odland  
Charley Royer  
Brian Steinburg

Heather Trim  
Ron Turner  
Tod Vogel

**Staff**

Bob Chandler  
Marshall Foster  
David Goldberg  
David Graves  
Steve Pearce  
Nathan Torgelson

---

Patrick Gordon - RFQ will go out, looking for teams. We're working to develop a recommendation for the process of selection of teams. Recommendations were initially due at the end of August, but we're accelerating the work to come up with recommendations by April 30<sup>th</sup> to city. A lot of discussion going on around the edges, angst we're all hearing, begging the question if we're going too fast with this process. Put down some major concerns, along with recommendation, here are the pros and cons of recommendations, and pros and cons of staying with the original schedule or not, show we've considered those things that impact or compromise it. We're not talking in terms of years here, we're talking in months. What risks or advantages are we taking on or inheriting?

Cary Moon - We were requested to "please speed up". We need should not overstep our boundaries – respect the request.

John Nesholm - Design team has been put in place for seawall, everyone agrees to have waterfront team work with seawall design team, given that it's already been set, we're not really given a choice. We may need to meet twice a month instead of once a month.

Brian Steinberg - What stage is the seawall design team at so far?

Steve Pearce - Underway.

Patrick Gordon - There is overlap, is the four months critical? Pro is to maximize the overlap.

Ron Turner - A qualified recommendation. We don't have an institutional group in place to evaluate the consultants we're interviewing. We're interim group who's doing the interviewing. We want the client in place before hiring the consultant. Recommendation has severe limitations. Even

though we're doing it quickly, based in RFQ scope of work in seawall, there is a real issue, along with that qualification we should talk about the sequencing about how this project goes. That's another qualification. Making recommendation but a qualified recommendation as far as what it means.

Patrick Gordon - Not necessarily a pro or con.

Brian Steinberg - What do we need to do immediately issues up to the RFQ? We need the client on board before we make the hire. Could focus on the RFQ, and continue to shape client.

Mary Johnston - Consultants will want to know who's on the selection committee; we really have to start looking at that.

Patrick Gordon - Who is the client? Does it produce some challenges to the process if we don't know that ahead of time?

Mary Johnston - Attitude of "are these people organized and together or not"" will influence it.

Charley Royer - City is client, what is lacking is entity, need oversight and second voice, and evolve into something that will run it over time.

Steve Pearce - City has to be client, the client group won't be selecting the consultant, we can't do that.

Patrick Gordon - City is the client, intent of the city to create an advisory board.

John Nesholm – There is precedent for the city and a private group to hire a consultant based on mixed committee, City signs the contract.

Craig Hanway - We all agree that we want a significant overlap of these design teams as much as possible, two year design, we're talking about two phases one broad and one specific. Is there a realistic way to overlap those and have teams in place before those decisions are imminent?

Patrick Gordon - There is all of 2011 overlapping design on both regards. Most of 2012 Year to 1 ½ overlap, critical.

Steve Pearce - Critical part of this process, spring of 2011, need seawall to get through consultation process. Long process, will need to bring 1 alternative to the consultation.

Ron Turner - That is the hypothetical end. Would like to know the justification, what creates the end?

Steve Pearce - Sequencing, delay removing the viaduct until we got the seawall done. Trying to get the gain in the construction period.

Patrick Gordon – John Nesholm's initial point, desire, overlap in integration as much as possible. How to address that in the context of our conversation? Overlap is good, caution without an entity we're at some risk. If we didn't do it in April when could you do it and feel comfortable? Two months longer and quantify that.

Cary Moon - The RFQ is one way of what project city would like to build, see who's on the selection team is just as important to bidder. Second, in a meeting a couple of weeks ago where seawall team is presenting scoping of how to approach city and work. Leader of seawall effort, and number one concern is this client group needs to come up with clear vision in order for them to succeed. Want us to be there for them and guiding the process and how seawall fits in. Working in real projects, know that working in constraints is effect.

Patrick Gordon - Working in parallel with Partnerships Subcommittee, convergence at some point. Some definition on scope, put together, not a conversation to end today, a component to build RFQ and how to feedback of overall committee how this all comes together

David Goldberg – There is a big discussion of “partnership” that will grow at the over this spring and summer; discussing various iterations of the partnership. (It) will change overtime based on scope of project. Concern now is, how is that partnership represented during consultant selection and design phase. Our thought is that we can bring together an advisory group, to work with you to do that. At the same time we can provide understanding to consultant about decision making environment, such as Design Commission and knowledge of principles of organization which will carry through various “its” and interview panel. We do think we would bring forward as much assurance and descriptiveness as we can, partner of selection process, and presence during design.

Patrick Gordon - We can agree to be constructive in that regard. What attributes, what would we like to see in the part of the consultation process? Expertise? Representation? What advisory board will ultimately become or inform the “it”. Be transparent, good that we're looking at both sides, recognizing there are serious pros and serious concerns, CM's right, we're not being asked to say either or, we're being asked to accelerate that.

Heather Trim - Go around say pros and cons.

Bob Donegan - We don't have a client, letter from mayor and council last week. They believe the project has been accelerated, when I talk with Sally and Tom they believe we're on the regular schedule.

Charley Royer - We'll know more about the meeting tomorrow. Our intention tomorrow is there is still concern about accelerating this, Mayor and Council that formed the council told us that's what we want to do, that's how we want to do it. We're going to get the council to tell us more than what we are saw in the letter.

Bob Donegan -We don't have a scope, budget, models defined or looked at. Those are all cons. Pros: Safety issue.

Charley Royer - Sobering news . People are talking, we need a little more clarity.

Heather Trim - Pros, to accelerate, this is the fifth or sixth waterfront committee that's happened since 2002, political support, about people who are going to vote for this money, they're going to get

sicker and sicker and going through process, they'll be frustrated if it grinds to a halt again. Sake of public, speed it up.

Brian Steinberg - Overlap of design Pro. Can you can achieve that overlap. Arbitrary backtrack of schedule that forces us to accelerate. Are we that much less safe if we hold off two months and may be delay seawall design effort to contain that overlap. We have one chance to get it right and need to do what we need to do to get it right.

Craig Hanway - Pros are covered, Cons is we don't have a written program that defines what we're asking this team to do. We lose control of what the end product is going to be if we don't have opportunity to go through program exercise.

Gary Glant - Don't want half baked idea, happen end of May.

Todd Vogel - Reaching the public, getting people behind what we're doing with the waterfront and design, full visioning and developing support.

John Nesholm - Program, this committee will never create program; what is appropriate and what is possible will happen later. Extreme fear about getting caught in politics b/w council and mayor, we have written orders and we should proceed by that until we get a new set of written directions. We have clear directions, and it's our job to execute it.

Ron Turner - Rushed? Not able to deal with institutional client. Group that could create agency or authority, group can operate independently of things, preclude of a larger thing. Bring consultant early will be a good early. Help in programming and analysis. That describes the kind of consultant we get, not design consultant, hire a planning consultant that guides the next committee, with a tremendous amount of experience which changing the whole scope.

John Odland - Simple terms of this letter smacks of lack of clarity except for a date. I have no concept what it is we're being requested to provide by the date given. There will be a lot more we'll learn. Why is April 10, 2010 the deadline? What difference does August make? Seems the span of time might allow us to contribute to his 100 year project more effectively. I don't understand the deadline. I know there are safety issues, but it's two month and this is a 100 year project.

Mary Johnston - List the second meeting, from the first meeting, form we were going to use, whether if it's one consultant through the whole thing, or one consultant with additional teams. Maybe we should look at two consultant scenario, define amount of work, send out another RFQ.

Ron Turner - Length of time frame, better to have in team planning, speaking for planning, rather than having single team. Allows local consultants to get in when someone frames it.

Patrick Gordon - Let's define a scope of work that is someone conditioned by fact that there's a board. Programming, defining overall scope, putting matches and vision up, get it moving and accelerated, recognize it's not 100 percent documented by the time we're done. Based by April deadline, some time in May or October engagement.

David Goldberg -Steering committee in place by time in mid-July.

Marshall Foster - Pretty clear sense in order for this to work, have public oversight. Need to have "it" that starts with committee subset of this group, to roll into PDA, that action needs to happen very quickly for this to take place. Need quick action to create client.

Charley Royer - There's nothing that this committee can oversight and be nimble going forward with 40 odd people. Mayor and Council can have subcommittee, reporting back to committee. More fingerprints on this will be better. Have C/M choose members and go forward.

Cary Moon - Remind us in this discussion, we were empowered to make decisions about the process, keep that in mind, we're not first in line for those seats.

Patrick Gordon - See subcommittee's role as going back to CWPC, as a whole to make recommendation, discussion is good and lively, nice consistency, we go back to big committee and saying here's what we did and asking. This is not the end, there are some themes here that play into and considerations consistency. Valuable to have conversation around RFQ that the team puts out, to read them and comment on them. Ask what about them that resonate with us. Central library, Seattle Center, Olympic Sculpture Park, some for seawall and Mercer Street extension. Conversation and reactions folks had that stuck out to you.

Marshall Foster - Good information about what works, what doesn't. In terms of layout and structure, I'm impressed with Sculpture Park RFQ. Document expressing programmatic goals of project. It's a different project – has a defined landscape program, building program. Here we would talk about public space, utilities, transportation, in concise way. Laying out clearly how selection will take place, phases unfold, team's role. OSP RFQ seems like a nice model.

Patrick Gordon - Like same RFQ, in two parks, there was a clear program that was written. On RFQ, it left door wide open for creative responses. Visions, aspirations, context on how project going forward, left fair amount of room, for people to respond creatively.

Cary Moon - On Design Commission at time doing OSP submission, Art Museum had tight solution, open to input. 20 fantastic submittals and five brilliant ones. RFQ did good job to bring best talent in country to come out.

Mary Johnston - Freedom and creativity allowed because it had certain things pinned down. Management, etc. some things we don't have that we need to pin down. Slim RFQ, as of Library, big program. We need the equivalent of program summary that's in OSP. Address missing pieces, to allow that flexibility, what I said at beginning gives people response and confidence to express that kind of flexibility. Program generated with public input, but we can sketch outline of programming that's a product of this committee needs to model.

Patrick Gordon - How much of it can be done in advance of RFQ

Marshall Foster - Public sees it as credible. Level of our guiding principles, organizes the work in a way that lead designer bring specific designer can bring in pieces. Nine to 25 acres of public space, thread needle to bring public in at all these different phases. Detailed program that Bob

showed us with Post Office Square, we're looking at much broader swath. Something to be said how they were able to summarize key objects not to do it in a way that's finite.

John Nesholm - High level conceptual program guide like the Waterfront Opportunities map.

Ron Turner - Need some work. This plan has boundaries. I don't think we have boundaries yet. Scale of boundaries has to include boundaries, take Puget Sound rim, or is it just a focus on concept plan as developed by city, circumscribed, city building scale. Scale consultant gets is really going to make a difference.

Patrick Gordon - Connects with two phasing. Opening door wide open can be too open, project visioning side, leave door cracked open, quality of response on a whole city level, embrace that knowing there's a second component to narrow it down.

David Goldberg - Time given, we do address outline of scope in RFQ, potential elements of a program.

John Nesholm - Some version of Property Ownership map, dark green element, specific piece, going all the way up to Sculpture Park, some version of that program.

Patrick Gordon - Some kind of definition with bigger context, with invitation that we're interested in your thoughts.

Brian Steinberg - Two phase approach, first phase developing framework is really a programming phase. Creating big gestural diagram that will lead and guide us of things to come. Need definition what our understanding of what the problem is. Here's the opportunity, there should be connections, opportunity of waterfront, supporting idea of open handed.

Cary Moon - Specific design of street, utility location, need to go from general into very specific. And we will be ready to design specific public spaces, that could be added to conversation.

Marshall Foster - Framework plan, and design happening in parallel. Don't miss opportunity. Timing, integration with seawall team.

Patrick Gordon - Allowing ourselves flexibility and bring right folks on board those things we know and we don't know.

David Goldberg - Might be helpful to go through outline, what we have written down already.

Heather Trim - Program is the most important thing said by Bob Weinberg. Sculpture Park have six bullets, in our program in our committee, we can't design our program now, can have eight to ten bullets of categories of programs. We need to have cart before the horse.

Patrick Gordon - Guiding principles be stepping stone for that. Program is different than principles.

Marshall Foster - As the team is developing specific design for spaces, huge process for public engagement, first step to develop program. Planning exercise more than design exercise. They're going to lead to develop that program, people, habitat, how pieces fit.

Todd Vogel - Public planning and public outreach, we need people who are specialists who are experts in that process.

Marshall Foster - Part of the goal is can we get those resources to table early, seawall is out of the gate. Program now, doing it in a vacuum we don't have resources now to do larger public engagement around the program .

Ron Turner - Extensive diagrammatic analysis, vocabulary of seawall create framework plan look like refinement of that plan. Planning vision which will go on. Do synthesis part, analytical frame, planner or architect, will bring their input and value system into the picture. Don't believe in passive consultants. Consultant bring vision along expertise, consultant shows opportunities and constraints, programming specific areas. Constraints. Public input. Master plan might occur. Consultant take it into detail enough schematically. Consultant can work with framework, with constraints, knowledge, value to table before going to community. Aggressive value based planner. Difficult program, not hard process.

Mary Johnston - Lead be planner? Who would be lead?

Ron Turner - Planner, landscape architect, architect. Spatial design, need technical work, falls into river of those disciplines, not preclude any particular specialization until you see the work they do and the team they assemble.

Patrick Gordon - Flexibility and creativity of this thing, respond to based on the program, what's the form of that invitation? Come up with can it be brief and be wide opened? What are the benefits of that approach to it?

Ron Turner - You can describe that, multiple scales, three scales: regional, specific development, detailed design scale. Satisfy need to accelerate the seawall.

Patrick Gordon - This is a dynamic process.

David Goldberg -Background, working with that kind of process and request for qualifications. Go through RFQ in outline format, then going into scope of work, then program. RFQ is info we hand out and criteria and organizes everything. Scope of work, many requests for qualifications, best ones tells consultant scope of work and tell them to do better. Program is essential, what is they're doing and how to make a decision. What things do we value that we must know at beginning of this project. We need to get there before we describe the project in its full. RFQs be broken up into sections, project description and drawing to point of boundaries. Multiple scales. Overview summary of legislation. Scope. Project funding. Overview of selection process. Lens through which to review of what they're going to read in detail. Second, project goals and synthesis of program and guiding principles. How should I be thinking? What is it they're asking for? Design process, general scope of work, knowing detailed contractual scope of work. Include phase one, conceptual, design. Scope element of outreach and engagement plan. City project management. Request for Qualifications. What are we looking for? What can they do? Submittal requirements. Two phase, review of qualifications followed by some form public display of their brilliance. Schedule: when is it going to happen.

Criteria: submittal, interview. Legalese, additional information. WMBE. Public ownership of documents, legal statements, etc. Scope of work is more detailed, project management, huge project, need to be on scope of work. Framework, what is framework? Larger scale. Includes vision, broad program about what geographic, upland, broad program. Linear connections, land use, public facilities, etc. Conceptual design, envisioning, funded parts of project. Five to ten elements of design, go through higher level of design to give us assurance that we can do this. Urban design, moving from big framework, est. framework some work is going in a little more detail to give us assurance that utilities are in right location. Conceptual design in funded elements. Environmental work that need to be spelled out. Specific task for coordination on another project. Public outreach and engagement, best defined as a cohesive program. Phase Two, when we know how much money we have, another iteration of the "it" beginning to gel, design element, final design. More outreach and engagement. Design program: we don't know a lot of these things, what is it we can provide these people. Core principles, key element, to points of spatial things. Connections of roadways, functions we're trying to accommodate. Project elements, public open spaces. Specific reference documents they can get to. Bibliography, building on history. Synthesizing a lot of that, placing all of that good work into context of public project. Legislation. Expectations of outreach and engagement, tone and bar and types of engagement we're looking for. Project oversight, client, firm discussion, looking all the way to the end of operations and management, development of partnerships overtime.

Patrick Gordon - Design development, we're talking more about an overall planning framework, careful be putting expectation, not to get be stuck in schematic design, not ready to do. Word smithing.

Cary Moon - How should we do this? A million of good ideas.

John Odland – Will there be online answers to consultant questions?

Next meeting: April 6<sup>th</sup>.